

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 4 is added.

Support for new claim 4 can be found, for example, on page 8, lines 3-16 of the specification.

Thus, no new matter is added. In view of at least the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Knight and

Examiner Lorence at the personal interview held December 21, 2006, are appreciated.

The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

*Interview  
Record OK  
Date 3/14/07  
PPLC 3/14/07*

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over O'Neal (U.S. Patent No. 5,064,157) in view of Ueng (U.S. Patent No. 4,802,751); and claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over O'Neal in view of Ueng, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Saunders, IV (U.S. Patent No. 4,700,919). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

These rejections are improper because 1) the Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); and 2) Ueng is not analogous art.

- 1) The Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met (MPEP §§ 2142, 2143). 1) There must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to the skilled artisan, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. 2) There must be a reasonable expectation of success. 3) The prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The first two criteria must both be found in the prior art, and not